



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/715,709	11/18/2003	Robert A. Relyea	60001.318US01	5419
27488 7590 04/30/2008 MERCHANT & GOULD (MICROSOFT) P.O. BOX 2903 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903				
EXAMINER				
KANG, INSUN				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2193				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
04/30/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/715,709

Applicant(s)

RELYEA ET AL.

Examiner

INSUN KANG

Art Unit

2193

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 January 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 20 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/CD/CD)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responding to Applicant's response filed on 1/24/2008.
2. As per applicant's request, claims 1, 3, 4, 8, 10, 12, 15, and 17-20 have been amended.
3. Claims 1-20 are pending in the application.

Claim Objections

4. Claim 20 is objected to because of the following informalities: "the" in "the an ML" in line 2 needs to be deleted. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-5, 7-12, and 14-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bray ("XML Namespaces by Example, 1999) in view of Lurie et al. ("What's in a namespace?," techrepublic.com, CNET networks, Inc., published on 5/29/2002) hereafter Lurie.

Per claim 1:

Bray discloses:

A method for mapping a tag in a markup language (ML) document to a class using namespaces, comprising: analyzing a tag in the ML document; referencing a definition file location attribute in the ML document, (i.e. page 1, see line 1-7 of the XML code) wherein the definition file

location attribute is identified by the tag (i.e., page 1, see lines 1-4 of XML code,

`xmlns:h="http://www.w3.org/HTML/1998/html4);`

Bray further discloses retrieving a definition file from a location identified by the definition file location attribute (i.e., page 1, see lines 1-2 of XML code). Bray does not explicitly teach that the definition file includes a list of common language runtime namespaces wherein each common language runtime namespace includes a list of common language classes associated with the common language runtime namespace. However, Lurie teaches such common language runtime namespaces (i.e., "the concept of namespaces and assemblies with the C# using directive and the VB Imports statement in Visual Studio.NET," page 2, first paragraph; "In the CLR, the classes and structures contained in each of the namespaces represent a common theme of development responsibility," page 2 fourth paragraph; Figure A) was known in the pertinent art, at the time applicant's invention was made, to "represent a method of interacting with external code libraries that may be new to the Microsoft developer (page 2, first paragraph)" and "a common theme of development responsibility (page 2, fourth paragraph)." It would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art to modify Bray's XML definition file to include CLR namespaces taught by Lurie. The modification would be obvious because one having ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to allow grouping of related CLR classes in .NET environment (page 2, second-fourth paragraph).

Bray in view of Lurie further discloses referencing a common language runtime namespace related to the tag within the definition file to determine the common language runtime class associated with the tag(i.e., page 1, see paragraph 4 lines 1-3).

Bray does not explicitly teach locating the common language runtime class in an assembly such that the tag is mapped to the common language runtime class. However, Lurie teaches that the CLR namespaces are spread across many assemblies (page 2, third paragraph) was known in the pertinent art, at the time applicant's invention was made, to form .NET security boundary, introduce a cleaner method of object versioning than that presented by COM, provide for side-by-side execution, and permit the development of simple applications that can be executed without an install process (page 4, second paragraph). It would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art to modify Bray's disclosed system to locate the CLR class in an assembly taught by Lurie. The modification would be obvious because one having ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to represent the simplified physical deployment with easy control of versioning, security, and other aspects of library deployment that traditionally had to be performed by hand (page 5 second paragraph).

Per claim 2:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Bray teaches:

wherein analyzing a tag further comprises analyzing the tags in linear order as listed in the ML document (i.e. page 1, the XML code).

Per claim 3:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Bray teaches:

wherein analyzing a tag further comprises reading a prefix corresponding to an ML namespace related to the tag (i.e. page 1, paragraph 4 lines 1-3).

Per claim 4:

Bray in view of Lurie discloses: defining the ML namespace using the prefix, wherein the prefix maps to an extensible markup language namespace (i.e. “the elements prefixed with xdc are associated with a namespace,” page 1, paragraph 4 line 1). Lurie further discloses: the definition file maps the extensible markup language namespace to a common language runtime namespace and the assembly (page 3 second paragraph).

Per claim 5:

The rejection of claim 3 is incorporated, and further, Bray teaches:
wherein the prefix is defined in the ML documents (i.e. “the elements prefixed with xdc are associated with a namespace,” page 1, paragraph 4 line 1).

Per claim 7:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Bray teaches:
wherein retrieving a definition file further comprises retrieving the definition file from a network location specified by definition file location attribute (i.e. the XML code in page 1).

Per claim 8:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Lurie discloses: locating the common language runtime class in an assembly further comprises locating the common language runtime class in a dynamic link library, the dynamic link library comprising common language runtime

classes of functions associated with the common language runtime namespace of the definition file (i.e. page 3 second paragraph).

Per claim 9:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Bray teaches:
generating the ML document, the ML document comprising the tag and the definition file location attribute (i.e. the XML code in page 1, comprising tags and xmlns).

Per claim 10:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Bray in view of Lurie teaches:
wherein the definition file comprises a list of the common language runtime namespaces, schemas and assemblies associated with the common language runtime class related to the common language runtime namespace (i.e. the XML code in page 1, comprising tags and xmlns).

Per claim 11:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Bray teaches:
wherein the namespace of the definition file is associated with a property within an element of the ML document (i.e. xmlns, the XML code in page 1).

Per claims 12 and 14-18, they are the medium versions of claims 1-5 and 7-11, respectively, and are rejected for the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claims 1-5 and 7-11 above.

Per claims 19-20, they are the system versions of claims 1-4, respectively, and are rejected for the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claims 1-4 above.

7. Claims 6 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bray ("XML Namespaces by Example, 1999), in view of Lurie et al. ("What's in a namespace?," techrepublic.com, CNET networks, Inc., published on 5/29/2002) hereafter Lurie, and further in view of Chao et al. (US 2004/0103199) hereafter Chao.

Per claim 6:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further:

Bray and Lurie do not explicitly teach determining whether the definition file is available locally in a cache, and if not available, storing the retrieved definition file in the cache. However, Chao teaches it was known in the pertinent art, at the time applicant's invention was made, to allow a user to cache the appropriate data (i.e. paragraph 0059). It would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art to modify the disclosed system of Bray and Lurie to incorporate the teachings of Chao. The modification would be obvious because one having ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to perform a faster retrieval by using a cache (i.e. paragraph 0059).

Per claim 13, it is the medium version of claim 6, respectively, and is rejected for the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claim 6 above.

Response to Amendment

8. The amendments to the claims filed on 1/24/2008 do not comply with the requirements of 37 CFR 1.121(c) because: claim 4 has been amended but the identifier "original" is used. Clarification is requested. To expedite the prosecution, the application has been further examined.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to INSUN KANG whose telephone number is (571)272-3724. The examiner can normally be reached on M-R 7:30-6 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lewis A. Bullock, Jr. can be reached on 571-272-3759. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Insun Kang/
Examiner, Art Unit 2193

/Lewis A. Bullock, Jr./
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2193